



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/565,111	02/19/2007	Jurgen Frevert	DEBE:063US/ 10513682	6017
32425	7590	08/07/2009	EXAMINER	
FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI L.L.P. 600 CONGRESS AVE. SUITE 2400 AUSTIN, TX 78701			DESAI, ANAND U	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		1656		
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		08/07/2009	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/565,111	FREVERT, JURGEN
	Examiner	Art Unit
	ANAND U. DESAI	1656

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 May 2009.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) 2 and 12 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1,3-11,13 and 14 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION***Election/Restrictions***

1. Applicant's species election without traverse of a composition wherein the surface active agent is polysorbate, the two amino acids are Asn and Asp, and the protein agent is *Clostridium botulinum* neurotoxin in the reply filed on May 20, 2009 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)). Applicants state claims 5-10, 11, 13, and 14 read on the elected species.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

2. Claims 2 and 12 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected species inventions, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on May 20, 2009.

3. Claims 1, 3-11, 13, and 14 are currently under examination.

Priority

4. Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d). The certified copy has been filed in the instant application. Should applicant desire to obtain the benefit of foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d) prior to declaration of an interference, a certified English translation of the foreign application must be submitted in reply to this action. 37 CFR 41.154(b) and 41.202(e).

Failure to provide a certified translation may result in no benefit being accorded for the non-English application.

Information Disclosure Statement

5. The information disclosure statement filed September 7, 2006 fails to comply with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97, 1.98 and MPEP § 609 because the electronic document in the file history is blank with no 1449 form or references cited. Applicant is advised that the date of any re-submission of any item of information contained in this information disclosure statement or the submission of any missing element(s) will be the date of submission for purposes of determining compliance with the requirements based on the time of filing the statement, including all certification requirements for statements under 37 CFR 1.97(e). See MPEP § 609.05(a).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7. Claims 1, 3-11, 13, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

8. Regarding claims 1 and 5, the phrase "preferably" renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitation(s) following the phrase are part of the claimed invention. See MPEP § 2173.05(d). The parenthesis also renders the claim indefinite. Is the claim drawn to tenside as the only non-ionic detergent?

9. Claim 3 is dependent on claim 1 which does not recite any variable items c) or d).

10. Regarding claims 7 and 11, the phrase "such as" renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitations following the phrase are part of the claimed invention. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).

11. The parenthesis in claim 7 also renders the claim indefinite.

12. In claim 13, the use of "in particular" and "preferred" render the claim indefinite.

13. Claims dependent on a rejected claim are rejected for depending on a rejected claim and failing to cure the indefiniteness.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

14. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

15. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

16. Claims 1, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adjei et al. (U.S. Patent 6,136,294) in view of Kotitschke et al. (U.S. Patent 4,370,264).

In short, the focus when making a determination of obviousness should be on what a person of ordinary skill in the pertinent art would have known at the time of the invention, and on what such a person would have reasonably expected to have been able to do in view of that knowledge. This is so regardless of whether the source of that knowledge and ability was documentary prior art, general knowledge in the art, or common sense. “A person of ordinary skill in the art is also a person of ordinary creativity, not an automaton.”*KSR*, 550 U.S. at ___, 82 USPQ2d at 1397. “[I]n many cases a person of ordinary skill will be able to fit the teachings of multiple patents together like pieces of a puzzle.”*Id.* Office personnel may also take into account “the inferences and creative steps that a person of ordinary skill in the art would employ.”*Id.* at ___, 82 USPQ2d at 1396. In addition to the factors above, Office personnel may rely on their own technical expertise to describe the knowledge and skills of a person of ordinary skill in the art. The Federal Circuit has stated that examiners and administrative patent judges on the Board are “persons of scientific competence in the fields in which they work” and that their findings are “informed by their scientific knowledge, as to the meaning of prior art references to persons of ordinary skill in the art.” *In re Berg* , 320 F.3d 1310, 1315, 65 USPQ2d 2003, 2007 (Fed. Cir. 2003).

Prior art is not limited just to the references being applied, but includes the understanding of one of ordinary skill in the art. The prior art reference (or references when combined) need not teach or suggest all the claim limitations, however, Office personnel must explain why the difference(s) between the prior art and the claimed invention would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. The “mere existence of differences between the prior art and an invention does not establish the

invention's nonobviousness." *Dann v. Johnston*, 425 U.S. 219, 230, 189 USPQ 257, 261 (1976).

Adjei et al. disclose the preparation and stabilization of pharmaceutical formulation by using amino acids selected from the group consisting of glycine, glycine, alanine, valine, leucine, isoleucine, methionine, threonine, isovaline, phenylalanine, tyrosine, serine, histidine, tryptophan, proline, hydroxyproline, arginine, ornithine, asparagine, citrulline, aspartic acid, cysteine, glutamic acid, glutamine, lysine, hydroxylysine, N-acetyl-L-cysteine, phenylalanine, trans-4-hydroxy-L-proline, tyrosine, L-aspartyl-L-phenylalanine methylester and a mixture of any of the foregoing as stabilizers (see claim 2).

Kotitschke et al. disclose a process of sterilizing a peptide blood coagulation factor VIII pharmaceutical formulation using the non-ionic detergent tenside to stabilize the peptide during sterilization (see claims 1-6).

It would have been obvious to the skilled artisan to use known peptide stabilizing techniques to generate a pharmaceutical with high specific activity. A person having ordinary skill in the art would have expected to succeed in making the pharmaceutical currently claimed because the prior art has shown the use of non-ionic detergents and amino acids to stabilize pharmaceutical formulations.

Conclusion

17. No claims are allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ANAND U. DESAI whose telephone number is

Art Unit: 1656

(571)272-0947. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 9:00 a.m. - 5:30 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew J. Wang can be reached on (571)272-0811. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

August 3, 2009
/ANAND U DESAI/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1656